

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. DIVA/118DIV1

Serial No. 10/690,856

Page 7 of 9

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the final Office Action mailed May 21, 2007. Claims 1-33 are pending, of which claims 5-9 and 15-20 are withdrawn from consideration, and claims 1-4, 10-14 and 21-33 are rejected.

By this response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 10 to further clarify Applicants' invention. No new matter has been added.

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, Applicants believe that all of the claims are allowable. It is to be understood that, by amending the claims, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant response, including amendments.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 10-14 and 21-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Freeman et al. (5,724,091, hereinafter "Freeman"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to further clarify Applicants' invention. Specifically, the amended claim 1 recites, in part: "determining shifts needed to be applied to timing information in a second video stream in order to generate recalculated timing information; wherein the shifts are determined based on a last received clock reference" (emphasis added). The amendment is fully supported by the original specification, e.g., p. 11, lines 18-31. Thus, no new matter has been added.

This is different from Freeman's teaching in which a time code identifies the timing for multiple pictures and locks the pictures together, and is used to keep two clocks at the transmission and receive end synchronously connected. Then, each of the multiplexed video streams is synchronized to the clocks, with each individual channel being referenced to a common reference point (e.g., col. 15, lines 22-33).

575794-1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. DIVA/118DIV1

Serial No. 10/690,856

Page 8 of 9

By contrast, Applicants' timing shifts, and thus, the recalculated timing information, is based on a last received reference, e.g., from a previous or old stream, as opposed to a common reference point.

Furthermore, since each individual channel in Freeman is already referenced to a common reference point, there is no need in Freeman to apply any recalculated timing information to a second video stream, as provided in Applicants' invention.

Thus, Applicants submit that the cited portions of Freeman do not teach or suggest at least the features such as determining timing shifts, in which the shifts are based on a last received reference, and replacing timing information in the second video stream with recalculated information.

As such, Freeman fails to teach each and every element of Applicants' invention of claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Freeman, and is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Independent claim 10 recites features similar to those of independent claim 1. For at least the same reasons discussed herein with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that independent claim 10 is also not anticipated by Freeman, and is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Dependent claims 2-4, 11-14 and 21-33 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 10, and recite additional limitations thereof. As such, and for at least the same reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that these dependent claims also are not anticipated by Freeman and are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

THE SECONDARY REFERENCES

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this Office Action.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. DIVA/118DIV1


Serial No. 10/690,856

Page 9 of 9

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that all claims presently pending in this application are in condition for allowance. If however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/19/07
Eamon J. Wall, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,414
(732) 530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702